



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

FIN

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/675,002	09/29/2000	KOJI KIKUCHI	35.C14844	2053
5514	7590	04/20/2005	EXAMINER	
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			MIRZA, ADNAN M	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2145

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/675,002	KIKUCHI, KOJI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Adnan M Mirza	2145

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burgess (U.S. 5,796,633) and Lau (U.S., 6,101,500).

As per claims 1,5,17,21 Burgess disclosed a data processing apparatus that is adapted to communicate data through a network to each of a plurality of computers and a plurality of peripheral devices connected to said network, comprising: display means for displaying said plurality of computers and said the plurality of peripheral devices as symbol information onto a virtual system display screen (col. 5, lines 33-41);

However Burgess failed to disclose first discriminating means for discriminating from the plurality of computers, a licenser computer having a license server function for issuing a predetermined license to at least one of said data processing apparatus and any other of the plurality of the computers; and first control means for controlling the licenser computer

discriminated by said first discriminating means such that the licenser computer may be identified from other devices on the virtual system display screen.

In the same field of endeavor Lau disclosed MS-DOS operating systems from Microsoft Corporation, the Unix Operating system available from many Vendors, such as Sun Microsystems, Inc. and the Hewlett-Packard Corporation, or the Net ware or Intranet- Ware operating systems available from Novell, Incorporated (windows and MS-Dos are registered trademark in the United States licensed exclusively through X/Open Company, Ltd, NetWare and Intranet Ware are registered trademarks of Novell, Incorporated) (col. 9, lines 15-25).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated first discriminating means for discriminating a licenser computer having a license server function for giving a predetermined license from said plurality of computers to said data processing apparatus; and first control means for controlling the computer discriminated by said first discriminating means so as to be displayed in a manner such that it can be identified from other devices on said virtual system display screen as taught by Lau in the method of Burgess to allow easy tracking of the configuration of computers in the network.

3. As per claims 2,6,10,14,18,22 Burgess-Lau disclosed further comprising: second discriminating means for discriminating, from the plurality of computers, licensee computers to which the predetermined license has been issued from the licenser computer discriminated by said first discriminating means (Lau, col. 9, lines 54-67); and second control means for

Art Unit: 2145

controlling the computers discriminated by said second discriminating means such that the licensee computers may be identified from other devices on the virtual system display screen (Lau, col. 10, lines 47-56).

4. As per claims 3,7,11,15,19,23 Burgess-Lau disclosed further comprising: third discriminating means for discriminating a server device having an image input server function which may be used by said data processing apparatus (Burgess, col. 5, lines 7-16); third control means for controlling the server device discriminated by said third discriminating mean such that the server device be identified from other devices on the virtual system display screen (Burgess, col. 9, lines 35-50); selecting means for selecting a symbol on said virtual system display screen; and service supplying means for supplying a common service to each of the licensee computers to which the predetermined license has been issued from the licensor computer, when the licensor computer and the server device have been selected by said selecting means (Lau, col. 9, lines 54-67).

5. As per claim 4 Burgess-Lau disclosed wherein the common service which is supplied by said service supplying means includes a distribution service for distributing a same data to each of the licensee computer (Burgess, col. 9, lines 52-67).

6. As per claims 9,13 has the same limitations as to claims 1 and 5 therefore under the same relations claim 9 can be rejected.

7. As per claims 8,12,16,20,24 Burgess-Lau disclosed wherein the service which is supplied by said service supplying step includes a distribution service for distributing same data to each of said licensee computers (Burgess, col. 9, lines 52-67).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/18/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments are as follows.

9. Applicant argued that prior art did not disclose discriminating a licenser computer having a license server function for issuing a predetermined license to a data processing apparatus. The prior art also failed to disclose controlling a licenser computer such that the licenser computer may be identified from other devices on a virtual system display screen.

As to applicants argument Lau disclosed MS-DOS operating systems from Microsoft Corporation, the Unix Operating system available from many Vendors, such as Sun Microsystems, Inc. and the Hewlett-Packard Corporation, or the Net ware or Intranet- Ware operating systems available from Novell, Incorporated (windows and MS-Dos are registered trademark in the United States licensed exclusively through X/Open Company, Ltd, NetWare and Intranet Ware are registered trademarks of Novell, Incorporated) (Lau, col. 9, lines 15-25). One ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention it would have been obvious to discriminate different computers or users or servers on the basis of licensee agreements. Lau stated in the

above paragraph that different computer has to be licensed in order for the different vendors to use it. Also Lau in the above statement stated that Different operating system are licensed by different Vendors who also maker of the computers like SUN, IBM, HP that discriminate on the basis of the licenses of the operating system.

10. Applicant argued that prior art did not disclose “a data processing apparatus that is adapted to communicate data through a network to each of a plurality of computers and a plurality of peripheral devices connected to said network, comprising: display means for displaying said plurality of computers and said the plurality of peripheral devices as symbol information onto a virtual system display screen”.

As to applicant's arguments Burgess disclosed “configuration information that may be obtained by configuration procedure regarding the operating system include the data of installation, the registered owner, the registered organization, the current version, the system root directory, the current version of the operating system, the product type, the build number of the operating system, and various start-up options of the operating system” (col. 5, lines 59-65). Burgess further disclosed “Computer comprises process, random access memory, read only memory, mouse, keyboard and input/output devices such as printer, disk drives, display and communications link” (col. 4, lines 62-66). One ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention interrupted the peripheral devices as keyboard, printer, mouse, printer etc.

11. Applicant argued that prior art did not disclose "first discriminating means for discriminating from the plurality of computers, a licenser computer having a license server function for issuing a predetermined license to at least one of said data processing apparatus and any other of the plurality of computers; and first control means for controlling the licenser computer discriminated by said first discriminating means such that the licenser computer may be identified from other devices on the virtual system display screen".

As to applicant's arguments Lau disclosed "MS-DOS operating systems from Microsoft Corporation, the Unix Operating system available from many Vendors, such as Sun Microsystems, Inc. and the Hewlett-Packard Corporation, or the Net ware or Intranet- Ware operating systems available from Novell, Incorporated (windows and MS-Dos are registered trademark in the United States licensed exclusively through X/Open Company, Ltd, NetWare and Intranet Ware are registered trademarks of Novell, Incorporated)" (col. 9, lines 15-25). One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention interrupted the Unix and MS-DOS operating systems are available in different versions and be identified by different licenser computer systems.

Examiner recommends that the Applicant's claims should reflect the details argued.

Conclusion

12. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Adnan Mirza whose telephone number is (703)-305-4633.

14. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday during normal business hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dharia Rupal can be reached on (703)-305-4003. The fax for this group is (703)-746-7239.

15. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)-746-7239 (For Status Inquiries, Informal or Draft Communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT");

(703)-746-7239 (For Official Communications Intended for entry, please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE"),

(703)-746-7238 (For After Final Communications).

16. Any Inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-305-3900.

Any response to a final action should be mailed to:

BOX AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to 4th Floor Receptionist, Crystal Park II,
2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA 22202.

AM

Adnan Mirza
Examiner

V. Martin-Wallace
VALENCIA MARTIN-WALLACE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700